



COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

17575 Peak Avenue Morgan Hill CA 95037 (408) 778-6480 Fax (408) 779-7236
Website Address: www.morgan-hill.ca.gov

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

REGULAR MEETING

AUGUST 11, 2009

PRESENT: Escobar, Hart, Liegl, Moniz, Mueller, Tanda

ABSENT: Koepp-Baker

LATE: None

STAFF: Community Development Director (CDD) Molloy Previsich, Deputy Director of Public Works (DDPW) Bjarke, Senior Civil Engineer (SCE) Creer, and Minutes Clerk Johnson

Chair Tanda called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m., requesting Commissioner Moniz to lead the pledge of allegiance to the U.S. flag, with all present being invited to join the recitation.

DECLARATION OF POSTING OF AGENDA

Minutes Clerk Johnson certified that the meeting's agenda was duly noticed and posted in accordance with Government Code Section 54954.2.

OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC COMMENT

Chair Tanda opened, and then closed, the floor to public comment for matters not appearing on the agenda.

MINUTES:

July 28, 2009

COMMISSIONERS MULLER/ESCOBAR MOTIONED TO APPROVE THE JULY 28, 2009 MINUTES WITH THE FOLLOWING REVISIONS:

Page 6, paragraph 4: If the City Council approves ~~a substantially changed Ordinance, will that 'kick up' the plan check~~ **approves a sustainable building Ordinance, will that force a new plan check**

Page 6, paragraph 7: history on a project ~~Lacrosse Street 'about three years ago'~~

Page 9, paragraph 1: ... really bad **timing to be sending** ~~addressing~~ this matter....

~~and I don't think we should bother the City Council until we can come back with a better picture."~~ **it should be considered. The Council is working on current Budget**

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

AUGUST 11, 2009

PAGE 2

issues given the recent State action."

Page 9, paragraph 9: transfer of maintenance funds, ~~then we need to be set on why it is needed."~~ *we need to be able to say why it is needed and how the funds might be replaced."*

Page10, Paragraph 5: typing corrections made: ...~~RD~~DCS projects...

Page 14, paragraph 6:sharp fall off in the ~~number of approved allocations~~ *number of available allocations in future years.*

THE MOTION PASSED (5-0-1-1) WITH THE FOLLOWING VOTE: AYES: ESCOBAR, HART, LIEGL, MONIZ, MUELLER; NOES: NONE; ABSTAIN: TANDA, [minutes of July 14, 2009; and items 1, 2, 3, and 4, as he had not been present for the discussion and/or vote]; ABSENT: KOEPP-BAKER.

Clarifying the motion, it was noted that items 5 and 6 of the July 28 Planning Commission minutes had been voted on by all the Commissioners who were present for the meeting; consequently, THE VOTE FOR THE JULY 28, 2009 MINUTES (ITEMS 5 AND 6) WAS: (6-0-0-1) AYES: ESCOBAR, HART, LIEGL, MONIZ, MUELLER, TANDA; NOES: NONE; ABSTAIN: NONE; ABSENT: KOEPP-BAKER.

1)GENERAL PLAN CIRCULATION ELEMENT AMENDMENT:

DISCUSSION OF CITY OF MORGAN HILL PROPOSED CIRCULATION ELEMENT UPDATE AND DRAFT EIR

CDD Molloy Previsich presented the staff report, noting that DDPW Bjarke and SCE Creer also worked on the effort and were present at the meeting. The following matters will be addressed at the meeting:

- development of a new citywide traffic model
- review of the City's level of Service (LOS) policy
- land use development projections and alternate scenarios
- model-recommended circulation network
- proposed General Plan Circulation Element Amendment, including new "smart growth" goal and policies
- key findings of the EIR and Fehr and Peers TIA regarding the proposed General Plan Circulation Amendment

CDD Molloy Previsich advised that the City Council had adopted revised Guidelines for Preparation of TIAs on May 28, 2008 and at the same time had initiated General Plan amendment to propose revision of the LOS policy to a 'tiered' approach that would allow for LOS F in the downtown area and LOS E at selected intersections.

The TIA evaluated two different types of possible circulation network amendments:

- Model Results Network Amendments
- Additional Possible Circulation General Plan Amendments, such as the possible narrowing of Monterey Road in the downtown area from 4 lanes to 2 lanes
- Impacts were characterized under both the Existing LOS Policy and the proposed Tiered LOS Policy.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

AUGUST 11, 2009

PAGE 3

CDD Molloy Previsich emphasized that decisions about the proposed changes to the Circulation Element would be considered under that process rather than the Downtown Specific Plan and DTSP EIR process, even though both of the EIRs contained circulation information for the possible circulation amendments.

Continuing with the overview, CDD Molloy Previsich informed that the staff memorandum in the agenda packet summarizes the methodologies and findings of the transportation studies into 20 pages, plus the impact and mitigation summary table from the EIR, in an attempt to maximize accessibility to the most important information, for the Commissioners and the public.

Commissioners then discussed the format of the dialogue to occur at this meeting, which was to be Q&A as the various aspects of the study were raised.

CDD Molloy Previsich called attention to the prepared memo, emphasizing the following:

- staff had been surprised that the new modeling revealed such a significant number of recommended changes to the city's planned circulation network, but there are reasons for this
- the model is much more precise and a higher level of quality for local circulation planning, which is different from the 2001 study based on a regional model with much less detail.
- staff accentuated the other reasons for the variance in model results, which is outlined in the studies and in the staff memorandum

Regarding Community Meetings, there are three scheduled meetings to present the information to the public: Saturday morning, August 29th; Monday evening, August 31st; and Thursday evening, September 3rd. There is also a Special Planning Commission meeting set for 7 PM on September 1, 2009 for the purpose of accepting comments on both the Draft EIR for the proposed General Plan Circulation Element Amendment, and the Draft EIR for the proposed Downtown Specific Plan.

Continuing, CDD Molloy Previsich explained that when RDA completed the Plan Amendment in 2006, it stated that its priorities were to improve downtown and complete key circulation routes, which are both focused on addressing certain blighting factors identified in the RDA project area. A mitigation measure in the EIR prepared for the Plan Amendment was to update the existing traffic demand model so that appropriate improvements and priorities could be established prior to investing in new roads.

Fehr and Peers was hired to develop a new traffic model, using city development projections and other regional development projections largely consistent with overall ABAG projections and the South County Circulation Study land use inputs. The transportation studies generated much of the content of the Circulation Element Update, and they are included in the EIR CEQA document. We now know that the 2001 Circulation Element reflects 'way more capacity on our local roads than is actually needed'. From a land use perspective, staff rechecked all assumptions and

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

AUGUST 11, 2009

PAGE 4

ran the model again, so the data was very deliberately put into the model to ensure reliable results. The projections are based on development occurring from the center core out and emphasizing infilling west of Highway 101 rather than going into new areas west of Highway 101.

Commissioner Mueller cited reference in the Plan to ‘filling up the business park’, which is a ‘huge assumption’ in that an application for a General Plan Amendment has been filed. CDD Molloy Previsich responded that the studies were structured to evaluate several scenarios, based on different sets of assumptions, so both the existing business park (under Current General Plan Scenario) and the possible land use amendment (under Cumulative General Plan Amendments Scenario) are studied.

Commissioner Mueller asked, “The 2001 Circulation Plan was based on traffic data from 1997. At that time, the study said we were not at peak traffic flow; but close, with the traffic flow through Morgan Hill to Silicon Valley being very heavy. Are the Consultants now saying we will never get back to that volume?” CDD Molloy Previsich replied that the model does reflect Highway 101 to be at eight lanes by 2030 through Morgan Hill, as included in VTA Long Term Transportation Plan. Also, the Coyote Valley Research Park is included in the projected development by 2030; not the Coyote Valley Specific Plan with its 20,000 housing units, which had been included in the VTA model at the time the South County Circulation Study was prepared. Also, there are currently many “missing links” in the city’s existing circulation network, and by 2030 many of these will be completed and linked up, so travel will follow a different pattern than existed in 1997. The reasons for why the new model produces different results are listed in the five bullets on page four of the memo. Also, the former development projections from the City were more ‘straight line assuming continued levels of dot-com-type growth’ for the more intensive SCCS scenarios. The other city and VTA models are much “chunkier”, with larger Traffic Analysis Zones, which is fine for regional traffic analysis but not as good for local planning purposes. (*see attachment one to memo*) The new model is more accurate for traffic generation and assignment of trips to roadways.

Chair Tanda said, “I hope it is time for technical questions now.” He went on to explain that about 37 years ago, he was project engineer for San Jose and employed for about 30 years in that position. “My question is: regarding capacity constraint – what kind of simulation was used and how was it allocated?” CDD Molloy Previsich stated that certain technical questions will be put to the consultants with responses available at a future meeting. However, she indicated that the Consultants did go through validation and calibration processes as part of the model development. One of the validations was changing assumptions such as taking away the Highway 101 widening, and seeing if trips responded in a logical manner, which did occur.

Discussion ensued regarding modeling points of validation for traffic and land use. CDD Molloy Previsich detailed the pre-set limits which were in place for measuring accuracy. CDD Molloy Previsich cautioned, “Developers will likely still need to do traffic studies for local proposed projects; this study effort is for citywide transportation planning and Circulation Element Update purposes.”

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

AUGUST 11, 2009

PAGE 5

Chair Tanda commented, “It is generally very difficult to do accurate simulations – I do wonder if consultants were successful? In a smaller zone, there is more likelihood of more accurate projections for zone, but it is very difficult to load it as simulations for loading onto streets may be difficult to determine. I am curious as to how the Consultants did it. As it is very difficult, I’d like to know how to check if their loading was accurate.”

CDD Molloy Previsich answered, “Fehr & Peers have done many studies for the City and project TIAs for development applications. So their staff is familiar with the area.” Over 800 Traffic Analysis Zones were created for the model structure, compared to just over 100 in past models. Chair Tanda continued, saying, “Has the Morgan Hill model been compared to models of cities to the north and south – heavy on north – to ascertain if their models, such as that of Morgan Hill, show zones which will be external? I’m really curious of the cities to the north and south.”

CDD Molloy Previsich responded, “We had been through the level of planning with a regional travel demand model for the South County Circulation Study. So the regional “gateway” assumptions for future development and network changes are consistent with the SCCS and VTA’s regional modeling. The things that have been refined include Morgan Hill’s land use projections (but still largely consistent with ABAG control projections), and that the Coyote Valley Specific Plan has been discontinued. So based on talks with San Jose and VTA, Morgan Hill’s model does not assume CV Specific Plan, but just the approved CV Research Park. The current assumption is that Coyote Valley will have about the same number of units as now exist, and the Research Park will produce about 20,000 new jobs.

Commissioner Mueller indicated intent to send an e-mail regarding other technical questions.

CDD Molloy Previsich then turned to how the analysis was structured. We originally intended to build a new model consistent with VTA’s but reflecting local refinements, and then to study four possible circulation amendments:

- narrow Monterey Road through Downtown from 4 lanes to two
- not close Depot at Dunne; not grade-separate Dunne at the railroad crossing
- shift Walnut Grove extension to the west
- not connecting San Pedro to Spring

Given the extent of model-recommended changes to the planned circulation network, multiple scenarios were developed and studied for the EIR, including with and without the above 4 network changes (ie. study of future conditions based ONLY on the model-recommended changes was done, which is a “keep Monterey four lanes” scenario; and study with the above changes was also done). The City Council and RDA identified key objectives of revitalizing downtown. So there were shorter-term 2015 projected scenarios included in the Downtown EIR TIA.

CDD Molloy Previsich then addressed the existing Level of Service (LOS) General

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

AUGUST 11, 2009

PAGE 6

Plan Policy, which generally contains LOS of **D+**, except for three LOS **D** locations and freeway ramps having LOS **E** designations. Knowing the objectives for Downtown, she said, we have proposed a LOS amendment for study, which would provide an exemption to meeting the LOS standard for the downtown core area, so that as projects came through, those projects would not have mitigation measures to create need for additional traffic studies and for mitigation and intersection widening downtown.

We are also recommending, at the freeway ramps and freeway access zones, and for certain intersections of regional through corridors, not to widen the intersections to achieve **D+**, but allow them to be **E**. Part of that would be to create some level of disincentive for drivers to be drawn off the freeway for their through travel. This is the Tiered LOS policy amendment. It is also important to bear in mind that for the remaining 20-22 hours of the day, LOS will be better than during peak hours.

Chair Tanda expressed hesitancy: “The notion of having streets during peak hours and freeway ramps at LOS **E** could encourage people not to get off freeway to reach San Jose, but it works the opposite as well: city residents may be doubtful of taking the freeway. The notion of LOS **F** is failure, so it becomes not a measure of service, but it is what it is. So if you are saying intersections are what they are and not designed for **E**, it appears you are designing for failure. Can you check what other Downtowns do in this area? It seems we should be designing for something rather than nothing.”

CDD Molloy Previsich responded that one of the reasons for having the proposal for Downtown to be **F** was to say: as the developers do a Downtown project, in the downtown, we not require a traffic study or mitigation, but they will still pay traffic impact fees. The study results indicate that we do not actually get to **F** at all intersections, but do at Main/Monterey signalized intersection. The Monterey/Fourth, Monterey/Fifth and Monterey/Central unsignalized intersections only go to **F** under the Cumulative GPA Scenario with Monterey Road narrowed to 2 lanes; but signal warrants are not met at these intersections. The signal warrants are met for Dunne/Del Monte and Depot/Main, which would produce LOS **C** and **D+** respectively.

Also, a mitigation measure is recommended to keep Monterey Road at 4 lanes between Dunne and Fifth, even under the Monterey Road Narrowing scenario, so that Dunne/Monterey intersection would have LOS **D+** or better.

Commissioner Mueller noted that none of scenarios specifically analyzes only the model-recommended changes plus re-routing Depot Street through the CCC parking lot to connect to Church. CDD Molloy Previsich responded that scenario is more like the “Current General Plan” as it retains Depot connection to Dunne. It would likely improve under a re-route, so the analysis is conservative. The “Possible Additional Circulation Amendments” scenario included:

- narrowing Monterey from 4 to 2 lanes
- not closing Depot Street at Dunne
- no Dunne/RR grade separation
- not connecting San Pedro to Spring

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

AUGUST 11, 2009

PAGE 7

Commissioner Mueller said, "If Depot is reconfigured to go through the parking lot, then that would lessen the impact on Fourth and Fifth."

CDD Molloy Previsich said, "It would help Monterey at Fourth and Fifth, but it may still be an F. Commissioner Mueller noted that it is an alternative which seems the right thing to do in the long term and the Dunne grade separation makes sense."

Chair Tanda said, "Regarding LOS. I think if staff will check LOS exemptions in other municipalities, we might know better what we want for Morgan Hill." He then noted that the extension of Hale and the Butterfield corridors will provide an alternate to driving through Downtown.

Commissioner Mueller spoke to other recommendations studied and targeted the intersection at Monterey/Wright, saying, "It seems a very low LOS to have E there, which could discourage people from going downtown. We need to have people go downtown. I think we need to carefully consider a LOS of F Downtown. I also have a concern going off the freeway ramps at reduced service as I recall the area in 1998 – 2000 when we had heavier traffic on the streets to get around Town and off the freeway. I think cutting down the ~~LPS~~ **LOS** is problematic. Also, 2030 will not be the end of growth and if we cut down too much, in 2070 we may have many more problems."

CDD Molloy Previsich said that Monterey/Wright does not actually go to LOS E, even though the proposed amendment under the Tiered LOS Policy would allow for that. Also, in the traffic modeling and under the Downtown Specific Plan, we were pretty aggressive with growth forecasts. Especially given economic conditions of the past couple of years, it may be less than forecasted. But the aggressive forecasts did emphasize development downtown, and "infilling" west of Highway 101, so that there is not a whole lot of development potential remaining west of Highway 101 after 2030. So we believe we are adequately planning for vehicular transportation west of Highway 101, and are also recommending a new 2-lane multi-modal arterial standard within a right of way that could be converted to accommodate 4 lanes if that really becomes necessary in the future.

Commissioner Mueller observed, "I think we ought to do something for Main between Butterfield and Hale. That is the north boundary to downtown and it is difficult to go east –west." Commissioner Mueller continued saying: "I think both sides of Main will redevelop. If the Downtown is really successful, then Main to Depot will redevelop." He went on to speak of desirable buildings to be redeveloped which would allow for intersection widening near Main/Monterey and perhaps to Hale.

CDD Molloy Previsich noted that the intersections in the Proposed Tiered LOS Policy that would be allowed to be E or F was defined at the beginning of the analysis, and the actual study is now showing that all of those intersections would actually go to E or F. But defining it this way and studying it allows ~~decisionmakers~~ **decision makers** to decide which to establish for a lower LOS. For areas with a lower LOS allowed, fewer EIRs and TIAs for projects would be

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

AUGUST 11, 2009

PAGE 8

required. However, the City and Redevelopment Agency can still pursue roadway improvements, even though the allowed LOS is lower.

Commissioner Mueller recalled that San Jose did exemptions from traffic standards when increasing residential densities and those exemptions were titled *neighborhoods policies*. CDD Molloy Previsich indicated that the proposed Smart Growth Goal and Policies in the proposed Circulation Element Amendment are similar to San Jose's neighborhood policies.

Commissioner Mueller commented, "In all of the traffic studies, there have been no credits for alternate modes of traffic. We do not have good mass transit." He then spoke of recently dropped Bus Line 15 service, and said, "It is very difficult to access mass transit here and I don't see it getting better. I believe CalTrain will not increase but decrease service. We have to think 'car based' transportation through the horizon."

CDD Molloy Previsich commented that she hoped the future land use pattern will encourage more local employment and dwelling units, thereby reducing need for cars and increasing use of alternate modes such as walking, bicycling and bus.

Commissioner Moniz asked for clarification of Butterfield and East Dunne. "Butterfield/Dunne is projected to have a LOS **D** under the Cumulative GPA Scenario with Monterey Narrowing. Is there not a significant impact when turning onto Dunne?" CDD Molloy Previsich indicated that the existing (2007) LOS at that location is D, and she called attention to the proposed policy (page 6) of the staff memo, which includes Butterfield/Dunne to be allowed at E. But the modeling shows that it actually is projected to stay at D, but is below the current standard of D+. Commissioner Moniz asked about a lack of mitigations at this location. CDD Molloy Previsich said that under CEQA the projected D is the same as existing D therefore it is not a significant impact.

Commissioner Moniz expressed surprise that the Monterey/Central intersection did not warrant signals. CDD Molloy Previsich said the technical analysis indicates that signalization is not warranted, but the TIA does include language suggesting continued monitoring of the area. Commissioner Moniz asked, "Not mitigation measure, but continued monitoring? [Yes] When would it show up – 2015?" CDD Molloy Previsich responded, "Probably after the 2030 horizon of this study", but conditions would be monitored earlier, as conditions increase congestion." Commissioner Moniz said, "We want to make sure it is looked at as time goes on."

Chair Tanda asked to have the Engineer recheck the numbers on Table 2.3-8 (page 70) as he stated concern that the capacity numbers seem very low. He referenced driving the freeway daily to his work, and although he travels in the opposite direction it seems that LOS is better than reflected, and the road capacity numbers used for the LOS seem very low.

CDD Molloy Previsich called attention to Roadways Network, and telling the Commissioners that the only significant impact to roadway segments in all of the various scenarios evaluated was under the Cumulative General Plan Amendment

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

AUGUST 11, 2009

PAGE 9

Scenario, to Monterey Avenue between Main and Dunne under the assumption that Monterey is narrowed to 2 lanes. This Cumulative Scenario reflects an assumption of about 1,200 new housing units under the Downtown Specific Plan General Plan Amendment, rather than the projected 600 units that is assumed to occur under the existing Downtown Plan. This Cumulative 2030 scenario includes the model-recommended circulation changes plus the four additional possible network modifications:

- narrow Monterey Road through Downtown from 4 lanes to 2
- not close Depot at Dunne; not grade-separate Dunne at the railroad crossing
- shift Walnut Grove extension to the west
- not connecting San Pedro to Spring

In this scenario the model does show some traffic shifting to parallel alternate routes of Butterfield Corridor and Santa Teresa/Hale Corridor.

CDD Molloy Previsich then led discussion of impacts to signalized and unsignalized intersections under the Cumulative GPA land use and circulation amendments:

1. Main/Monterey is at F with no mitigation available
2. Main/ Butterfield is at D, with mitigation available to improve LOS to **D+** (even though the Tiered LOS Policy proposes to allow an **E**, projected LOS is D)
3. Dunne/Monterey at C- in AM and D in PM, with mitigation available to provide D+ or better
4. Monterey/Central at F but does not meet signal warrants
5. Monterey/Fourth and Monterey/Fifth at F but do not meet signal warrants
6. Dunne/DelMonte at E in AM and F in PM; does meet signal warrants and so mitigation is installation of traffic signal

CDD Molloy Previsich reviewed the Freeway analysis (page 17). VTA Plan shows carpool lanes from Cochrane to Monterey Road in Gilroy, and this is reflected in Morgan Hill's model for 2030. The model was also run assuming it is NOT widened by 2030; under that assumption East-West traffic actually decreases, and North /South traffic increases; but the LOS levels do not change. In order to mitigate the impacts of additional traffic on freeways, widening to 5 lanes would be required, or installation of auxillary lanes between the off/on-ramps.

CDD Molloy Previsich discussed VTA & City's significance threshold in the adopted CMP, as well as CalTrans' threshold of significance. Under either threshold, freeway impacts are considered significant and unavoidable because there is no regional programmatic measure that exists, and payment of a pro-rata fair share from Morgan Hill development would still not result in the improvement being made. Planning for freeway improvements is a State and VTA responsibility.

Commissioner Escobar said he recalled there may have been a supplement to the Circulation Plan for 10 lanes. Discussion ensued regarding the Habitat Conservation Plan, which was tied to freeway development in Santa Clara County.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

AUGUST 11, 2009

PAGE 10

Other issues discussed were:

- need for regional programmatic measure for collection of impact fees so improvements can be completed
- still questions numbers of vehicles in freeway lanes that are considered to be LOS E
- railway grade separation analysis - recommendation: grade separation at Dunne; also grade separation at Madrone Parkway in the long term, which is mostly needed due to Coyote Valley development
- City may pursue at-grade Madrone Parkway Crossing as an interim or alternate improvement, in exchange for closing another existing at-grade crossing
- Madrone Parkway Crossing is still needed to get East-West north of Cochrane, but it only needs to be 2 lanes, not 4 lanes

Commissioner Mueller asked, "Why not close Tilton?" DDPW Bjarke stated, "The City just spent considerable money to upgrade Tilton." SEC Creer said, "One thing we have discussed: align Burnett with Tilton, and continue Butterfield North to Burnett, which would even further add to the utility of Butterfield Corridor, and even allow traffic to go east-west from Hale to Murphy. CDD Molloy Previsich indicated that the transportation study does address this as a desirable improvement to pursue, but it was not assumed in the traffic model, and implementation may not occur by 2030.

Commissioner Mueller said, "I could see Butterfield to Burnett for the High School but my concern is for that neighborhood at the freeway on the east side where there are acre lots. That makes the connection from Cochrane the starting point." CDD Molloy Previsich commented that the City might want to protect the right-of-way in the area.

Commissioner Mueller said his concern remained that Madrone Parkway would be a short term solution and felt a study of getting rid of Tilton would be in order. CDD Molloy Previsich indicated that the Consultants did not study that, because preserving East-West connections was important for city circulation.

Commissioner Mueller said, "The original proposal for Capriano {development} was to close Tilton or have it become a cul de sac and build across the railway tracks."

Discussion ensued regarding widening Monterey Road two lanes in each direction under the rail road north of downtown, where there are now a total of three lanes. CDD Molloy Previsich explained that the widening is part of the assumed 2015 circulation network.

Commissioner Liegl noted that the Downtown Plan indicated adding a lot of units and residents to the Downtown. "That's a lot of trips. Has it included in the scenarios what happens if those new residents work outside the Downtown area?" he asked. CDD Molloy Previsich explained that downtown trips were treated the same as other trips, and no reduction was assumed for alternate modes of travel

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

AUGUST 11, 2009

PAGE 11

such as walking and bicycles, even though some of that will occur in a mixed use neighborhood adjacent to the transit center and well-served by alternate modes. The Consultants used standard trip generation for the model. CDD Molloy Previsich explained that the trips would be spread out over time, and not all would be during peak hours. Commissioner Liegl said a concern would be the idea of widening Main; perhaps there is some feasible way to widen just in the most impacted area. Commissioner Liegl continued by stating, "We need to look at how to move traffic and people more effectively. Perhaps narrow the sidewalk instead of a standard eight feet. SEC Creer responded, "we can look at several alternatives now for the future. We do have the constraint of the railroad crossing, but between Butterfield and Depot there may be some potential for reconfiguration.

CDD Molloy Previsich reviewed the other findings of the EIR regarding potentially significant impacts in areas other than traffic, e.g., noise, construction noise and air quality impacts, and agricultural impacts from converting ag lands to roadways. She then reviewed next key steps for processing the proposed Circulation Element Amendment:

- Community Meetings August 29th, 31st, and Sept 3rd
- Planning Commission meetings for EIR comments on Sept 1st
- September 17th Draft EIR comment period closes
- Emphasis: circulation changes proposed will be considered under the Circulation Element Update process
- Staff will be recommending "no urgency" for a Monterey Road Narrowing decision; the City has applied for a streetscape planning Grant, and that would look at use of the right of way and alternate designs under both a 2-lane and 4-lane configuration
- time frame for completion of Final EIR will depend on number and nature of comments
- Commissioners made suggestions for: having information/responses from other cities before informational meetings with the public

Commissioner Mueller asked about the Morgan Hill Projections that are reflected in the modeling, which breaks out by year the new housing units and commented, "It seems to build up at a rapid clip between now and 2015. Are the 600 downtown units included?" CDD Molloy Previsich advised the projections for Downtown are aggressive and "frontloaded" based on assumed strong RDA participation, the RDCS Exemption, and so forth. Commissioner Mueller thought that only 23 are in the Downtown, but staff pointed out that the Sunsweet and Granary projects are also in the downtown core, and other projects in the downtown areas outside of the Core. Commissioner Mueller stated that 600 exempt units should be in the RDCS calculation so if we add another 600 then the 2020 population numbers should be much lower ***another 600 then the number of allocations per year after 2015 would be lower.*** CDD Molloy Previsich explained the City was is projecting lower household sizes in the downtown area, and also we will have more rental and senior units with lower persons per household.

Chair Tanda asked how best to offer Commissioner comments about the EIR to staff for final consideration. CDD Molloy Previsich said if the questions are for

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

AUGUST 11, 2009

PAGE 12

understanding parts of the Plan, that is part of the process of the work of the Planning Commission, and the Commissioners could e-mail staff with those questions. “However, if the comments are formal comments, then on 9/1 the Commissioners can give those in verbal comments or provide a written comment in letter form at that time or prior to the September 17th close of the comment period.”

Discussion ensued regarding:

- an ultimate Commissioners recommendation to be forwarded to the City Council
- clarification of difference in EIR and the General Plan Circulation Element Amendment
- timeline for EIR and General Plan Circulation Element Amendment acceptance
- staff recommendation for rerouting Depot to Church; CDD Molloy Previsich will provide further clarification
- the necessary distance to elevate Dunne over rail road tracks [SEC Creer explained that would ‘most likely be an underpass (not an overpass) as the constraint would be trying to be back up to grade when traffic reaches Church and the Terracina apartments; on the east side of the tracks the road may have to move up to some degree]
- agendas for upcoming Planning Commission meetings [at the September 1 Planning Commission meeting, the EIRs only for the Downtown Specific Plan and the General Plan Circulation Element Amendment elements

ANNOUNCEMENTS **COMMISSIONER** **IDENTIFIED ISSUES**

CDD Molloy Previsich reviewed that there is no September 8 meeting; September 15 will be a special or continued meeting

CITY COUNCIL **REPORTS**

None

ADJOURNMENT

Noting that there was no further business for the Planning Commission at this meeting, Chair Tanda adjourned the meeting at 9:21 p.m.

MINUTES PREPARED BY:

JUDI H. JOHNSON, Minutes Clerk